

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 434, the text of H.R. 3846 will be appended to the engrossment of H.R. 3081; and H.R. 3846 will be laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3842.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3842, MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3842, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at a bipartisan meeting on youth violence and missed rollcall vote on House Resolution 433 regarding the consideration of H.R. 1695. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2372, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this evening a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of March 13 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2372, the Private Property Rights Implementation Act.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14, to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as re-

ported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 376, OPEN-MARKET REORGANIZATION FOR THE BETTERMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 376) to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 2, 2000, at page H636.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the conference report on S. 376.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will pass and send to the President the conference report on S. 376, very important legislation to privatize the intergovernmental satellite organizations.

The bill lowers prices for consumers and promotes the free enterprise market. It opens new opportunities for American companies seeking to do business overseas. It creates new and better jobs. It breaks up a cartel. It ends a monopoly.

I started working on this issue when I became chairman of the Committee on Commerce in 1995. The bill the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and I introduced in the last Congress was reported out of the conference committee and passed 403 to 16. The bill we are considering today is based on and reflects the hard work we did back then.

This bill will lead to the pro-competitive privatization of the intergovernmental organizations, INTELSAT and Inmarsat.

INTELSAT, like the U.N., is a treaty-based organization, not a company. They cannot be sued, taxed, or regulated. Governments, not the market, determine its action.

INTELSAT is like the oil cartel OPEC. It is run by a combination of the world's governments and owned by a consortium of national telecommunications monopolies and dominant players: by government monopolies, for government monopolies, of government monopolies. Its supporters call it a "cooperative." Where I come from, that is called a "cartel."

The INTELSAT system is like the post office. Its U.S. signatory COMSAT has a government-sponsored monopoly over access for its services in the U.S.

Our legislation puts an end to all this. Our legislation requires privatization and an end of the U.N.-like intergovernmental structure. It also ends the privileges and immunities.

Our legislation ends the cartel by freeing up the existing ownership structure.

Finally, our legislation ends the monopoly over access to INTELSAT from the U.S. held by COMSAT.

I should add that we do welcome a pro-competitive INTELSAT into the international marketplace.

I urge all Members to support this consensus conference report and submit a joint statement on behalf of myself and the ranking democrat of the Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection Subcommittee, Mr. MARKEY.

JOINT STATEMENT OF PRIMARY ORIGINAL SPONSORS OF LEGISLATION COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE CHAIRMAN TOM BLILEY AND RANKING DEMOCRAT OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION SUBCOMMITTEE EDWARD J. MARKEY

The Conference Report the House is considering today is based on the hard work we have done on this issue over the years. As the primary sponsors of this legislation in the House we believe it is important for us to clarify the meaning of several provisions in this legislation.

First, section 624(1) is, with one change discussed below, identical to section 624(4) in H.R. 3261 and an identical provision in the bill which passed the House in the last Congress. Circumstances have changed with respect to this particular section which require clarification of its meaning. Last August, ICO, also known as ICO Global Communications (Holdings) Ltd., declared bankruptcy and bankruptcy proceedings have been ongoing since then. All references in the Conference Report to ICO are viewed as references to the entity formally known as ICO Global Communications (Holdings) Ltd.

The policy reasons for section 624 were that Inmarsat should not be able to expand by repurchasing all or some of, or control, its spin-off, ICO. A primary purpose of the legislation is to dilute the ownership by signatories or former signatories of INTELSAT, Inmarsat and their spin-offs.

When the bankruptcy process is complete, the charter of ICO is likely to have fundamentally changed. First, the ownership structure is likely to be very different from that of Inmarsat. Most importantly, ICO is